

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

PLASTRONICS SOCKET PARTNERS,  
LTD. ET AL,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONG WEON HWANG ET AL,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 2:18-CV-00014-JRG-RSP

**ORDER**

This case involves patent infringement claims and various breach of contract claims and counterclaims between Plaintiffs Plastronics Socket Partners, Ltd. (“Plastronics Socket”) and Plastronics H-Pin, Ltd. (“Plastronics H-Pin”) as well as Defendants Dong Weon Hwang, HiCon Co., Ltd. (“HiCon Limited”), and HiCon Company. Before the Court are (1) Defendants’ Objection (Dkt. No. 306) to Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 295); and (2) Defendant Hwang’s Objection (Dkt. No. 303) to Order (Dkt. No. 302). The Court will address each of these filings below.

**I. DEFENDANTS’ OBJECTION (DKT. NO. 306) TO REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (DKT. NO. 295)**


Defendants filed an Objection (Dkt. No. 306) to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 295), which resolved Plaintiffs’ First Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 204). This Objection was solely directed to the recommendation that summary judgment be granted with respect to the issue of standing. After a review of the record, the Court concludes that Defendants did not waive any standing argument. However, the Court concludes that the lack

of standing argument lacks merit as detailed in the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 165), which has been adopted by the Court. Consequently, the Court now **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 295) with the modification provided above.

**II. DEFENDANT HWANG'S OBJECTION (DKT. NO. 303) TO ORDER (DKT. NO. 302)**

Defendant Hwang also filed an Objection (Dkt. No. 303) to the Court's Order (Dkt. No. 302), which addressed Defendant Hwang's Notice of Dispute Regarding Case Scope After Dispositive Motion Rulings (Dkt. No. 298). After consideration of the record, including Defendant Hwang's notice, the underlying briefing for the Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Patent Infringement and Breach of Contract (Dkt. Nos. 209, 224, 241, 251), and the relevant transcripts, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's Order. The Court therefore **OVERRULES** any objections to that Order.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 3rd day of July, 2019.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY GILSTRAP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE